arXiv:1606.06346v3 [math.AP] 20 Nov 2016

ON NONEQUIVALENCE OF REGULAR BOUNDARY POINTS FOR SECOND-ORDER ELLIPTIC OPERATORS

N.V. KRYLOV AND TIMUR YASTRZHEMBSKIY

ABSTRACT. In this paper we present examples of nondivergence form second order elliptic operators with continuous coefficients such that L has an irregular boundary point that is regular for the Laplacian. Also for any eigenvalue spread < 1 of the matrix of the coefficients we provide an example of operator with discontinuous coefficients that has regular boundary points nonequivalent to Laplacian's (we give examples for each direction of nonequivalence). All examples are constructed for each dimension starting with 3.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $d \geq 2$ be an integer and let $\mathbb{R}^d$ be a Euclidean space of points $x = (x_1, \dots, x_d)$. We consider operators L of the form

$$L = a^{ij}(x)\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} \tag{1.1}$$

where $a(x) = (a^{ij}(x))$ is a symmetric matrix-valued Borel measurable function on $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$\theta|\xi|^2 \leq a^{ij}(x)\xi_i\xi_j \leq \theta^{-1}|\xi|^2$$

for some constant $\theta > 0$ and all $x, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $\kappa_1(x)$ and $\kappa_2(x)$ be the smallest and the biggest eigenvalues of $a(x)$. We introduce a quantity κ describing the eigenvalue spread of a as follows:

$$\kappa(x) = \frac{\kappa_1(x)}{\kappa_2(x)}.$$

Given a domain $G \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, under appropriate assumptions on a one can define the notion of regular points relative to L and G (see Section 2 for the definition). We write $L \leftrightarrow \Delta$ if the regular boundary points of L and Δ coincide (for any G). We write $L \not\to \Delta$ if L has a regular boundary point that is irregular for the Laplace operator and $\Delta \not\to L$ if it is the other way around.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 35J25, 35J67.

Key words and phrases. Dirichlet problem, regular points, Wiener's test.

The first author was partially supported by NSF Grant DMS-1160569 and by a grant from the Simons Foundation (#330456 to Nicolai Krylov) .

The characterization of regular boundary points is an important problem in the theory of elliptic equations and it has attracted a number of researchers. In case $L = \Delta$ this problem was solved by N. Wiener and the answer is given in the form of the so-called Wiener's test which involves the sum of certain capacities [21]. Observe that sometimes de la Vallée Poussin's criterion (see Exercise 7.6.7 and Remark 7.6.8 in [12]), valid for operators with continuous coefficients is more useful (cf. [8]). Wiener's result has been generalized in [2] for operators (1.1) with continuous coefficients, where Wiener's type criterion is given for the regularity of points. No new results are obtained as to when the regular points for the operator and the Laplacian coincide.

The application of Wiener's test in general appears to be a nontrivial problem (see Section 7.11 in [6] for some examples) and it is worth mentioning that sometimes one can prove that a certain point is regular or irregular by more elementary means. To prove that a boundary point is regular relative to Δ one can use barriers (see, for example, Section 7.6 in [12] for Hölder continuous a). In another direction to prove that a point is irregular relative to Δ one can construct a Dirichlet problem and a (perhaps, generalized) solution that fails to converge to its boundary data at that point. Such an example was constructed by H. Lebesgue [15] in 1913 before the discovery of the famous Wiener's test by N. Wiener [21] in 1924. A different example, having some similarities with the example in [15], was given in 1925 by P.S. Urysohn [20] who apparently was unaware of [15]. These techniques also work for operators (1.1) if the coefficients are regular enough.

In the general case of operators (1.1) several authors proved that, under certain conditions on the coefficients a, the regular boundary points for L and the Laplacian coincide. O.A. Oleinik [19] showed this under the assumption that a is $C^{3+\alpha}$. R.M. Hervé [5] proved the claim for operators L with Hölder continuous (which she calls Lipschitz continuous) coefficients. Significant improvement was done in [9], where it was shown that it suffices to require a to be uniformly Dini continuous. Later a somewhat weaker condition was discovered by Yu.A. Alkhutov (see [1]). In the same paper he also gave an example of operator (1.1) with discontinuous coefficients such that $L \leftrightarrow \Delta$.

However, it seems that the uniform Dini condition cannot be significantly relaxed. In particular, in [16] K. Miller constructed examples of $\Delta \not\to L$ for any $\kappa \in [0.5, 1)$ and $L \not\to \Delta$ for any $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ if $d = 3$. In all examples the coefficients are continuous everywhere except the origin. E.M. Landis [13] gave a more elementary example of $\Delta \not\to L$ for $d = 3$ and any $\kappa < 1$ and the coefficients a discontinuous at the origin. However, in other dimensions there was only partial progress. In the same article [16] K. Miller provided examples of $L \not\to \Delta$ for any κ close to 1 if $d = 2$ and examples of $L \not\to \Delta$ for any $\kappa \in (0, \frac{1}{d-2})$ if $d \geq 4$.

It turned out that $L \leftrightarrow \Delta$ also does not hold in the class of operators L with continuous coefficients. In [17] K. Miller gave a simple example of $L \not\to$

Δ with continuous a for any $d \geq 2$. To the best of the authors' knowledge, ours are the first examples of operators L with continuous coefficients such that $\Delta \not\to L$. We give these examples for any $d \geq 3$.

In this article we are also going to construct examples of $\Delta \not\to L$ and $L \not\to \Delta$ with coefficients discontinuous at the origin for any $\kappa < 1$ and any $d \geq 3$. An important feature of this article is that our proofs avoid any advanced analogues of the Wiener's criterion for operators (1.1). We use barriers to prove that a point is regular relative to L. In case $\Delta \not\to L$ we construct a generalized solution of the Dirichlet problem that is discontinuous at a single boundary point.

Our examples were inspired by Lebesgue's construction of an irregular point relative to Δ. It has to be pointed out that our examples also have some similarities with Landis's ones mentioned above. In particular, we essentially use the so-called s-potentials introduced in [15] arriving at them by combination of probabilistic and PDE ideas which are outlined in Section 7.

2. Generalities about regular points

Let G be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $B(G)$ be the space of bounded Borel measurable functions. Take $\delta \in (0,1)$. We restrict our attention to the operators (1.1) with coefficients of class $C^\delta_{\rm loc}(G)$. Take a domain $G' \subset \bar{G}' \subset G$. Suppose that $G' \in C^{2+\delta}$. By the Hölder-space theory of linear elliptic equations, for any $f \in C^\delta(\bar{G}')$, there exists a unique solution $u \in C^{2+\delta}(\bar{G}')$ of the equation $Lu = -f$ in G' with zero boundary condition on $\partial G'$. We set

$$\mathcal{R}(G')f = u.$$

Then, let G_n, $n = 1, 2, ...$, be a sequence of subdomains of class $C^{2+\delta}$ such that $G_n \subset G_{n+1} \subset \bar{G}_{n+1} \subset G$, $G = \cup_n G_n$. For $f \in C^\delta_{\rm loc}(G) \cap B(G)$ and $x \in G$ define

$$\mathcal{R}(G)f(x) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathcal{R}(G_n)f(x). \tag{2.1}$$

This definition coincides with Definition 7.2.2 of [12]. We will borrow a few facts as well from Chapter 7 of that book. It has to be said, however, that in Chapter 7 of [12] the coefficients of L are supposed to be of class $C^\delta(\mathbb{R}^d)$ rather than $C^\delta_{\rm loc}(G)$. The reader will easily check that what we are going to use is proved word for word in the same way as in [12] using only that the coefficients of L are in $C^\delta_{\rm loc}(G)$. Part of what is below can also be obtained from Remark 1.5.1 and Section 1.8 in [14].

We know from [12] that the limit in (2.1) exists, does not depend on the choice of G_n, and defines an operator satisfying $|\mathcal{R}(G)f| \leq \mathcal{R}(G)|f| \leq N \sup |f|$, where the constant N is independent of f.

Interior estimates show that, for any domains $G' \subset \bar{G}' \subset G'' \subset \bar{G}'' \subset G$ there exists a constant N such that

$$\|\mathcal{R}(G)f\|_{C^{2+\delta}(\bar{G}')} \leq N\|f\|_{C^\delta(\bar{G}'')} + N \sup_G |f|.$$

We also know that $L\mathcal{R}(G)f = -f$ in G if $f \in C^{\delta}_{\rm loc}(G) \cap B(G)$.

According to Definition 7.4.1 of [12] a point $p \in \partial G$ is called *regular* (relative to L and G) if

$$\lim_{G \ni x \to p} \mathcal{R}(G)1(x) = 0. \tag{2.2}$$

Otherwise p is an irregular point. Observe that if $G' \subset G$, $p \in \partial G' \cap \partial G$, and p is regular relative to L, G, then it is also regular relative to L, G'. This follows from the fact that $\mathcal{R}(G')1 \leq \mathcal{R}(G)1$.

It turns out (Theorem 7.4.7 of [12]) that, for any $c > 0$, a point p is regular relative to L, G if and only if it is regular relative to $L, G \cap B_c(p)$, where we use the notation

$$B_r(p) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x - p| < r\}, \quad B_r = B_r(0).$$

According to Definition 7.3.2 of [12], if $g \in C^{2+\delta}(\bar{G})$ and $x \in G$,

$$\pi(G)g(x) := g(x) + \mathcal{R}(G)(Lg)(x). \tag{2.3}$$

Obviously, $\pi(G)g \in C^{2+\delta}_{\rm loc}(G)$ and $L\pi(G)g = 0$ in G. By the interior estimates for L-harmonic functions, for any domain $G' \subset \bar{G}' \subset G$ there exists a constant N such that for any $g \in C^{2+\delta}(\bar{G})$

$$\|\pi(G)g\|_{C^{2+\delta}(\bar{G}')} \leq \varlimsup_{n \to \infty} \|\pi(G_n)g\|_{C^{2+\delta}(\bar{G}')} \leq N \varlimsup_{n \to \infty} \sup_{\partial G_n} |g| \leq N \sup_{\partial G} |g|.$$

The inequality between the extreme terms allows one in [12] to uniquely extend $\pi(G)$ by continuity to $g \in C(\partial G)$ and obtain an operator $\pi(G)$ such that, for any $g \in C(\partial G)$, we have $\pi(G)g \in C^{2+\delta}_{\rm loc}(G)$, $L\pi(G)g = 0$ in G, and $0 \leq \pi(G)g \leq 1$ in G if $0 \leq g \leq 1$ on ∂G.

By Exercise 7.4.12 of [12], a point $p \in \partial G$ is regular if and only if

$$\lim_{G \ni x \to p} \pi(G)g(x) = g(p) \tag{2.4}$$

for any continuous g given on ∂G. The fact that the regularity implies (2.4) for $g \in C^{2+\delta}(\bar{G})$ follows from definition (2.3) and the fact that $|\mathcal{R}(G)(Lg)| \leq \mathcal{R}(G)1 \sup |Lg|$. In the general case one uses uniform approximations of g by polynomials and the fact that $|\pi(G)g - \pi(G)q| \leq \sup |g - q|$. The opposite implication follows if one applies definition (2.3) to $g = |x-p|^2$ and observes that $Lg \geq 2d\theta$ and $\mathcal{R}(G)(Lg) \geq 2d\theta \mathcal{R}(G)1 \geq 0$.

According to Theorem 7.6.4 of [12] a point $p \in \partial G$ is regular if, for an $r > 0$ and $G_r := G \cap B_r(p)$, there exists a function w (called a barrier at p) such that

$$Lw \leq 0 \quad \text{in} \quad G_r, \qquad \inf_{x \in G_r \setminus G_\rho} w(x) > 0 \quad \forall \rho \in (0, r), \qquad \lim_{G \ni x \to p} w(x) = 0.$$

We are also going to use the following.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $p \in \partial G$ and $u, w \in C^{2+\delta}(\bar{G} \setminus B_\varepsilon(p))$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Suppose that $u, w \geq 0$, $Lu, Lw \leq 0$ in G,*

$$\beta := \varliminf_{\substack{x \in \partial G \\ x \to p}} u(x) > \varliminf_{\substack{x \in G \\ x \to p}} u(x) =: \alpha,$$

$$\lim_{G \ni x \to p} w(x) = \infty.$$

Then p is an irregular point relative to L, G.

Proof. Take $\gamma \in (\alpha, \beta)$ and $\varepsilon, \eta > 0$. By definition, for $x \in G \setminus \bar{B}_\varepsilon(p)$,

$$u(x) + \eta w(x) = -\mathcal{R}(G \setminus \bar{B}_\varepsilon(p))(Lu + \eta Lw) + \pi(G \setminus \bar{B}_\varepsilon(p))(u + \eta w)(x)$$
$$\geq \pi(G \setminus \bar{B}_\varepsilon(p))[(u + \eta w) \wedge \gamma](x).$$

We set $[(u + \eta w) \wedge \gamma](p) = \gamma$ and then $(u + \eta w) \wedge \gamma$ becomes a continuous function in $\bar{G}$. By sending $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$ and using Exercise 7.3.5 from Chapter 7 of [12], we obtain for $x \in G$ that

$$u(x) + \eta w(x) \geq \pi(G)[(u + \eta w) \wedge \gamma](x)$$

For $y \in \partial G$, $y \neq p$ define $g(y) = u(y) \wedge \gamma$ and set $g(p) = \gamma$. Then g is a continuous function on ∂G and $(u + \eta w) \wedge \gamma \geq g$ on ∂G. It follows that $u(x) + \eta w(x) \geq \pi(G)g(x)$ in G and, since $\eta > 0$ is arbitrary,

$$u(x) \geq \pi(G)g(x), \quad \alpha \geq \varliminf_{\substack{x \in G \\ x \to p}} \pi(G)g(x), \quad g(p) = \gamma > \alpha \geq \varliminf_{\substack{x \in G \\ x \to p}} \pi(G)g(x),$$

the latter showing that p is not regular. The lemma is proved. □

Remark 2.2. Here we present an example of an irregular relative to Δ boundary point which is due to H. Lebesgue [15]. The goal of this presentation is to make the reader familiar with some techniques used below in more complicated situations. In case $d = 3$, Lebesgue proved the existence of a domain for which the origin is not regular relative to Δ. P.S. Urysohn ([20]) showed that this holds for G defined below if $r(x_1) < \exp(-3/x_1)$.

For $d = 3$, H. Lebesgue considers

$$u(x_1, r) = \int_0^1 \frac{t}{[(t - x_1)^2 + r^2]^{1/2}}\, dt, \quad r = (x_2^2 + x_3^2)^{1/2}. \tag{2.5}$$

It is easy to see that u is a harmonic function on $\mathbb{R}^3$ except the interval $[0, 1]$ on the x_1-axis. The argument of H. Lebesgue is that the origin lies on the boundary of the domain between the closures of the level sets $u = 1/2$ and $u = 2$ and is irregular, since $u(0+, 0, 0) = 1 \neq 2$, in light of Lemma 2.1 in which one takes $w = 1/|x|$.

One can extract some more information about irregular surfaces in this example. For $0 < x_1 \leq 1/2$ we have

$$u(x_1, r) = u_1(x_1, r) + u_2(x_1, r),$$

where

$$u_2(x_1, r) := \int_{2x_1}^1 \frac{t}{[(t - x_1)^2 + r^2]^{1/2}}\, dt \to 1$$

as $(x_1, r) \to 0$ by the dominated convergence theorem (in the integrand $t - x_1 \geq (1/2)t$ and the integrand is less than 2), and

$$u_1(x_1, r) := \int_0^{2x_1} \frac{t}{[(t-x_1)^2 + r^2]^{1/2}}\, dt \;=\; r\psi(x_1/r),$$

where

$$\psi(y) := y \int_{-y}^{y} \frac{1}{(s^2+1)^{1/2}}\, ds$$

and the equality is obtained by the change of variables $t = x_1 + rs$ and the observation that $s/(s^2+1)^{1/2}$ is odd and its integral over a symmetric interval is zero. By using L'Hospital's rule one easily checks that $\psi(t) - 2t\ln t = [\psi(t)/t - 2\ln t]/(1/t) \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$. Also $x_1 \ln x_1 \to 0$ as $x_1 \downarrow 0$, so that $x_1 \ln(x_1/r) - x_1 \ln(1/r) \to 0$ and

$$u(x_1, r) - [1 + 2x_1 \ln(1/r)] \to 0. \tag{2.6}$$

if $x_1/r \to \infty$ and $x_1 \downarrow 0$.

Now take $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and define

$$r(x_1) = e^{-\varepsilon/x_1}, \quad \phi(x_1) := u(x_1, r(x_1)), \quad x_1 > 0. \tag{2.7}$$

By (2.6) we have $\phi(0+) = 1 + 2\varepsilon$.

Next, define $r(0) = 0$ and consider

$$G = B_1 \setminus \{x : (x_2^2 + x_3^2)^{1/2} \leq r(x_1), x_1 \geq 0\}.$$

It turns out that the origin is an irregular point of ∂G, no matter how small $\varepsilon > 0$ is. This follows at once from Lemma 2.1 if one takes $w = 1/|x|$ and notes that $u(0+, 0, 0) = 1 < 1 + \varepsilon$.

The above argument is simpler than the one in [20], yielding a more general result, and shorter than the one in L. Helms's elaboration of H. Lebesgue's original argument (see 4.4.11 in [4]), based on calculating $u(x_1, r)$ explicitly.

The surface

$$\{x : (x_2^2 + x_3^2)^{1/2} = e^{-\varepsilon/x_1}, x_1 \geq 0\}$$

is called the Lebesgue spine.

Remark 2.3. It turns out that the origin is an irregular point for the Laplacian even in a smaller domain

$$G' = G \cap (-G) = B_1 \setminus \{x : (x_2^2 + x_3^2)^{1/2} \leq e^{-\varepsilon/|x_1|}\}.$$

This easily follows from Wiener's test and the fact that the origin is irregular relative to G. This is also proved in Remark 7.1.

3. Main results

Let $d \geq 3$. We represent points $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ as $x = (x_1, x')$, where $x' = (x_2, x_3, \ldots, x_d) \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$.

Let $c > 0$ be a number and let $r \in C([0,c])$ be a nonnegative function such that $r(0) = 0$. We say that the surface

$$|x'| = r(x_1), \quad x_1 \in [0, c], \tag{3.1}$$

is regular relative to L if the origin is regular relative to L, G, where

$$G = B_c \setminus \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : |x'| \le r(x_1), x_1 \in [0, c]\}. \tag{3.2}$$

Remember that, according to the definitions in Section 2, to talk about regular points of G we need the coefficient L to belong to $C^{\delta}_{\mathrm{loc}}(G)$ for some $\delta \in (0, 1)$.

We are going to consider functions $u(x_1, r), x_1 \in \mathbb{R}, r \in \mathbb{R}_+ = [0, \infty)$. When it makes sense, denote

$$u_{x_1} = \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_1}, \quad u_r = \frac{\partial u}{\partial r}, \quad u_{x_1x_1} = \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial x_1 \partial x_1}, \quad u_{rr} = \frac{\partial^2 u}{\partial r \partial r}.$$

Let $\lambda(x)$ be any positive bounded function on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and $a_\lambda(x)$ be a $(d-1) \times (d-1)$ matrix-valued function with the following entries:

$$a^{ij}_\lambda(x) = \lambda(x)\delta^{ij} + (1 - \lambda(x))\frac{x_i x_j}{|x'|^2}, \quad i, j = 2, \dots, d, x' \ne 0, \tag{3.3}$$

$$a^{ij}_\lambda(x) = \delta^{ij}, \quad i, j = 2, \dots, d, x' = 0.$$

Next, we define the $d \times d$ matrix-valued $\tilde{a}_\lambda$ as follows

$$\tilde{a}^{1j}_\lambda(x) = \delta^{1j}, \quad \tilde{a}^{i1}_\lambda = \delta^{i1}, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, d,$$

$$\tilde{a}^{ij}_\lambda(x) = a^{ij}_\lambda(x), \quad i, j = 2, \dots, d. \tag{3.4}$$

Note that, for $x', z' \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \setminus \{0\}$ and $(z', x') = 0$ we have

$$a_\lambda(x)x' = x', \quad a_\lambda(x)z' = \lambda(x)z'.$$

This implies that, if $x' \ne 0$, the matrix $a_\lambda(x)$ has (at least) one eigenvalue equal to 1 and the remaining $d - 2$ eigenvalues are equal to $\lambda(x)$.

Let L_λ be the operator (1.1) with coefficients $\tilde{a}_\lambda$. Then it is a uniformly elliptic operator with bounded coefficients. Also note that, if $x' \ne 0$, we have $\kappa(x) = \lambda(x)$ for $\lambda(x) \le 1$ and $\kappa(x) = 1/\lambda(x)$ for $\lambda(x) > 1$.

Remark 3.1. Even if $\lambda \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the coefficients of L_λ might fail to be infinitely differentiable but they still belong to $C^\infty_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{x' = 0\})$. Furthermore, if $\lambda \in C^\infty_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{x' = 0\})$ and λ is continuous at the origin and $\lambda(0) = 1$, then $a_\lambda \in C^\infty_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{x' = 0\})$ and a_λ is continuous at the origin. In particular, it is continuous in the closure of G' defined in (3.6) below for any continuous increasing function $r(t), t \in [0, c]$ such that $r(t) > 0$ for $t > 0$ and $r(0) = 0$.

Let u be a sufficiently smooth function such that, for a function

$$v(x_1, r), \quad x_1 \in \mathbb{R}, \quad r \in \mathbb{R}_+ = [0, \infty),$$

we have $u(x) = v(x_1, |x'|)$. Then by what was said about the eigenvalues of the matrix $a_\lambda(x)$, for $x' \ne 0$ and $r = |x'|$, we have

$$L_\lambda u(x) = v_{x_1x_1} + v_{rr} + \lambda(x)\frac{d-2}{r}v_r. \tag{3.5}$$

Let us state the main results of this article. The first two theorems show that

$$\Delta \not\to L.$$

Theorem 3.2. *For any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and $\lambda(x) \equiv 1/\varepsilon$, there exists a domain of type*

$$G' = B_c \setminus \{x : |x'| \leq r(|x_1|)\}, \tag{3.6}$$

where r is a continuous function on $[0,c]$ with $r(t) > 0$ for $t > 0$ and $r(0) = 0$, for which the origin is regular for Δ and not regular for L_λ. Obviously, the coefficients of L_λ are infinitely differentiable in $\bar{G}' \setminus \{0\}$ and $\kappa = \varepsilon$ away from the x_1-axis.

Remark 3.3. By what was said right after (2.2), if the origin is regular relative to L, G, where G is taken from (3.2), then it is also regular relative to L, G' (this fact can be also easily explained in case $L = \Delta$ by using Wiener's test since the complement of G' is larger than that of G). In the proof of Theorem 3.2 a smooth function r will be chosen so that the origin is regular relative to Δ, G. It is also regular relative to Δ, G' by the above.

Observe further that one can find a smooth function $\zeta(x)$ with values in $[\varepsilon, 1]$ given in $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \{0\}$ such that it equals ε on an open set containing the interval $[-c, 0)$ of the x_1-axis and $\zeta(x) = 1$ in G'. Then, for $\nu(x) = \zeta(x)/\varepsilon$ and the operator L_ν, the origin is still an irregular point of $\partial G'$, since $L_\nu = L_\lambda$ in G', which implies (see Section 2) that the origin is also an irregular point relative to L_ν, G. Finally, notice that for the operator L_ν we have $\kappa \geq \varepsilon$, and the coefficients of L_ν have only one point of discontinuity in $\bar{G}$.

The coefficients of L_λ are discontinuous in $\bar{G}'$ in Theorem 3.2. Here is a stronger result the proof of which is more involved.

Theorem 3.4. *There is a continuous function $\lambda(x) > 0$ and a domain G' of type (3.6), where r is a continuous function on $[0,c]$ with $r(t) > 0$ for $t > 0$ and $r(0) = 0$, such that the origin is regular relative to Δ, G' and irregular relative to L_λ, G'. Moreover, the coefficients of L_λ are infinitely differentiable in $\bar{G}' \setminus \{0\}$ and continuous in $\bar{G}'$.*

Remark 3.5. The example which we use to prove Theorem 3.4 has many similarities with what was used in the past. In particular, Urysohn [20] used a function which is the sum of the Newtonian potentials. Landis in Section 4 of [13] used the sum of s-potentials to show that for $d = 3$, generally, $\Delta \not\to L$. We consider $d \geq 3$ and use integrals, that are easier to analyze, instead of the sums. In Landis's construction the operator L has discontinuous coefficients. Novruzov [18] considered domains of type (3.6) again when $d = 3$ and tried to push further Landis's construction to get an operator with continuous coefficients showing that $\Delta \not\to L$. He deals with sums of potentials of variable singularity, as we do with integrals instead of the sums. His idea, which we also adopt here, is to first construct a function and then find an equation which the function satisfies. However, numerous rather

inexplicable erroneous statements in [18], which were never commented on, corrected, or substantiated in later publications, do not allow one to accept his claimed statements as true facts. Furthermore, in the example in [18] the origin is not only irregular relative to L but also *irregular* relative to Δ. Still in [7] the authors refer to the example in [18] as a valid example showing that $\Delta \not\to L$ with L having continuous coefficients.

Here is a result showing that $L_\lambda \not\to \Delta$.

Theorem 3.6. *For any $\varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and $\lambda(x) \equiv \varepsilon$, there exists a domain G' of type (3.6), where r is a continuous function on $[0,c]$ with $r(t) > 0$ for $t > 0$ and $r(0) = 0$ such that the origin is regular relative to L_λ, G' and irregular relative to Δ, G'. Moreover, the coefficients of L_λ are infinitely differentiable in $\bar{G}' \setminus \{0\}$ and $\kappa = \varepsilon$ away from the x_1-axis.*

In comparison with Miller's examples from [16] and [17] of $L \not\to \Delta$, for any $d \geq 3$ (and not only for $d = 3$ as in [16]) , we present a domain G such that the interior of $\bar{G}$ is G.

4. Auxiliary results

Take and fix constants $b \in (-\infty, 0], c \in (0, \infty)$.

Lemma 4.1. *Let μ be a continuous function on $[b,c]$ and β and ν be continuous functions on $[b,c] \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\nu(t)$ is bounded, $\nu(t) > 1$ and $\beta(t) > 0$ on $[b,c] \setminus \{0\}$, and*

$$\int_b^c \beta(t)\, dt < \infty, \quad \int_b^c \beta(t)|t|^{-\nu(t)}\, dt = \infty. \tag{4.1}$$

If $x \notin [b,c]$ or $r > 0$ set

$$k_1(x,r) = \int_b^c \frac{\mu(t)\beta(t)}{[(t-x)^2 + r^2]^{\nu(t)/2}}\, dt,$$

$$k_2(x,r) = \int_b^c \frac{\beta(t)}{[(t-x)^2 + r^2]^{\nu(t)/2}}\, dt,$$

$$\omega(x,r) = \frac{k_1(x,r)}{k_2(x,r)}.$$

If $x \in [b,c]$ set

$$\omega(x,0) = \mu(x).$$

Then $\omega(x,r)$ is a continuous function on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$.

Proof. Clearly, we only need to show the continuity on the segment $[b,c]$ of the x-axis. Observe that owing to Fatou's lemma, (4.1), and the fact that $\nu > 1$ and $\beta > 0$ on $[b,c] \setminus \{0\}$, for any $x_0 \in [b,c]$ we have

$$\lim_{\substack{r \downarrow 0, \\ x \to x_0}} k_2(x,r) = \infty. \tag{4.2}$$

Furthermore, if $\delta(\varepsilon)$ is the modulus of continuity of μ, then from

$$k_1(x,r)=\mu(x_0)k_2(x,r)+\int_b^c\frac{(\mu(t)-\mu(x_0))\beta(t)}{[(t-x)^2+r^2]^{\nu(t)/2}}\,dt$$

and the estimates $|\mu(t)-\mu(x_0)|\leq\delta(\varepsilon)$ if $|t-x_0|\leq\varepsilon$ and $|\mu(t)-\mu(x_0)|\leq 2\sup|\mu|$ we see that

$$|k_1(x,r)-\mu(x_0)k_2(x,r)|\leq\delta(\varepsilon)k_2(x,r)+2\sup|\mu|\int_b^c\frac{\beta(t)}{\varepsilon^{\nu(t)}}\,dt,$$

where the last integral is finite for any $\varepsilon>0$ since ν is bounded. Now our assertion follows in light of (4.2). The lemma is proved. □

Remark 4.2. Obviously, if $\mu\geq\nu$, where ν is a number, then $\omega\geq\nu$.

Lemma 4.3. *Let μ and h be nonnegative functions on $[b,c]$ such μh is not identically equal to zero, μ is bounded, and*

$$\int_b^c|t|^{\mu(t)}h(t)\,dt<\infty. \tag{4.3}$$

For $x\in\mathbb{R}$, $r\geq 0$ introduce

$$u(x,r)=\int_b^c\frac{|t|^{\mu(t)}h(t)}{[(t-x)^2+r^2]^{\mu(t)/2}}\,dt. \tag{4.4}$$

Then the equation

$$u_{xx}(x,r)+u_{rr}(x,r)+\frac{\omega(x,r)}{r}u_r=0 \tag{4.5}$$

holds in $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}_+$ apart from the interval $[b,c]$ on the x-axis, where $\omega(x,r)$ is taken from Lemma 4.1 with $\beta(t)=\mu(t)t^{\mu(t)}h(t)$, and $\nu(t)=\mu(t)+2$.

Proof. Observe that, for any constant $\mu>0$, the function

$$\upsilon(x,r)=\frac{1}{(x^2+r^2)^{\mu/2}}$$

satisfies

$$\upsilon_x=-\mu\frac{x}{(x^2+r^2)^{1+\mu/2}},\quad \upsilon_r=-\mu\frac{r}{(x^2+r^2)^{1+\mu/2}},$$

$$\upsilon_{xx}=-\mu\frac{1}{(x^2+r^2)^{1+\mu/2}}+\mu(2+\mu)\frac{x^2}{(x^2+r^2)^{2+\mu/2}},$$

$$\upsilon_{rr}=-\mu\frac{1}{(x^2+r^2)^{1+\mu/2}}+\mu(2+\mu)\frac{r^2}{(x^2+r^2)^{2+\mu/2}},$$

$$\upsilon_{xx}+\upsilon_{rr}=-\frac{\mu}{r}\upsilon_r.$$

It follows that

$$u_{xx}+u_{rr}=\int_b^c\frac{\mu^2(t)|t|^{\mu(t)}h(t)}{[(t-x)^2+r^2]^{1+\mu(t)/2}}\,dt,$$

and, since

$$u_r = -r \int_b^c \frac{\mu(t)|t|^{\mu(t)} h(t)}{[(t-x)^2 + r^2]^{1+\mu(t)/2}}\, dt,$$

we have

$$u_{xx} + u_{rr} = -\frac{\omega(x,r)}{r} u_r,$$

and the lemma is proved. □

Remark 4.4. Assume the notation and conditions of Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 4.3. Assume that $c < 1$, $b = -c$ and μ and h are even functions. Also assume that $h(t)$ is decreasing, $\mu(t)$ and $t^{\mu(t)}h(t)$ are increasing functions on the interval $(0, c]$. Let

$$\psi(t, x, r) = \frac{\beta(t)}{[(t-x)^2 + r^2]^{\nu(t)/2}}.$$

Recall that $\omega(x, 0) = \mu(x)$ on $[b, c]$. This implies that if a function μ is not Dini continuous at 0, then so is $\omega(x, r)$ at $(0, 0)$. We claim that under the same assumption on $\mu(t)$ the function $\omega(x, r)$ is even not Dini continuous in a domain

$$D = \{(x, r) : r^2 + x^2 < c^2, r > r(|x|)\},$$

where $r(t)$ is any continuous increasing function on $[0, c]$ such that $0 < r(t) < t$ for $t > 0$ and $r(0) = 0$. Moreover, the Dini continuity fails again at the point $(0, 0)$.

To prove the claim observe that

$$k_2(x, r) = \int_{-c}^{c} \psi(t, x, r)\, dt$$

is an even function in x hence we will only consider the case $x > 0$. We have

$$|k_1(x, r) - \mu(0)k_2(x, r)| \geq (\mu(x/2) - \mu(0)) \left(\int_{-c}^{-x/2} + \int_{x/2}^{c} \right) \psi(t)\, dt. \quad (4.6)$$

Take any $(x, r) \in D$ and note that $[(t-x)^2 + r^2]^{\nu(t)}$ is a decreasing function in t on the interval $(0, x]$. This follows from the fact that $(t - x)^2 + r^2$ is a decreasing function of the argument t on $[0, x]$ and $(t - x)^2 + r^2 < 1$, $\forall t \in [0, x]$, and the function ν is increasing on $(0, c]$.

This combined with the fact that β is increasing on the interval $(0, c]$ imply that $\psi(t, x, r)$ is an increasing function in t on $(0, x]$. Therefore,

$$\int_{x/2}^{x} \psi(t, x, r)\, dt \geq \int_{0}^{x/2} \psi(t, x, r)\, dt. \quad (4.7)$$

Next, using the substitution $t = -s$ and our assumption that β and ν are even functions we conclude that

$$\int_0^{x/2} \psi(t, x, r)\, dt = \int_{-x/2}^{0} \frac{\beta(s)}{[(s+x)^2 + r^2]^{\nu(s)/2}}\, ds \geq \int_{-x/2}^{0} \psi(t, x, r)\, dt.$$

By this and (4.7) we get that

$$2\int_{x/2}^{x}\psi(t,x,r)\geq\int_{-x/2}^{x/2}\psi(t,x,r)\,dt.$$

The latter implies that

$$3\left(\int_{-c}^{-x/2}+\int_{x/2}^{c}\right)\psi(t,x,r)\,dt\geq k_2(x,r).$$

Therefore, the right hand side of (4.6) is greater than $(\mu(x/2)-\mu(0))k_2(x,r)/3$ and, thus,

$$|\omega(x,r)-\omega(0,0)|\geq(\mu(x/2)-\mu(0))/3. \tag{4.8}$$

If $\omega(x,r)$ were Dini continuous in D, then there would exist a continuous increasing function $\phi(t),t\in[0,c]$, such that $\phi(0)=0$,

$$\sup_{(x,r)\in D}|\omega(x,r)-\omega(0,0)|\leq\phi(\sqrt{x^2+r^2}),\quad\int_0^c\phi(t)/t\,dt<\infty.$$

Then using the fact that D contains a part of the line $r=x$ and (4.8) we obtain

$$\int_0^c\phi(\sqrt{2}t)/t\,dt\geq\int_0^c|\omega(x,x)-\omega(0,0)|\,dx/x\geq\frac{1}{3}\int_0^c\frac{\mu(x/2)-\mu(0)}{x}\,dx=\infty.$$

Thus, such ϕ does not exist and the claim is proved.

Lemma 4.5. *Let μ and h be nonnegative functions on $[b,c]$, let μ be nondecreasing on $(0,c]$, and let h be nonincreasing on $(0,c]$ such that $\mu(x)>1$ on $(0,c]$ and condition (4.3) is satisfied. Let $r(x)$ be a function on $(0,c]$ such that $(1/2)x\geq r(x)>0$ for small x and*

$$\overline{\lim_{x\downarrow0}}\,(\mu(x)-1)\ln(r(x)/x)<0, \tag{4.9}$$

$$\lim_{x\downarrow0}r(x)(x/r(x))^{\mu(x)}h(2x)\frac{1}{\mu(x)-1}=\infty. \tag{4.10}$$

Take u from (4.4). Then

$$\lim_{x\downarrow0}u(x,r(x))=\infty. \tag{4.11}$$

Proof. For $0\leq r\leq x$ we have

$$u(x,r)\geq\int_{x+r}^{2x}\frac{t^{\mu(t)}h(t)}{[(t-x)^2+r^2]^{\mu(t)/2}}\,dt\geq h(2x)\int_{x+r}^{2x}\frac{t^{\mu(t)}}{[(t-x)^2+r^2]^{\mu(t)/2}}\,dt,$$

where in the second inequality we used the fact that h is a decreasing function. We make the substitution $t=x+sr$ and observe that for $s\geq0$

$$(x/r+s)^{\mu(t)}\geq(x/r)^{\mu(t)}$$

and, for $1\leq s\leq x/r$, (recall that $r\leq x$)

$$\frac{x/r}{(s^2+1)^{1/2}}\geq1/\sqrt{2},\quad\left[\frac{x/r}{(s^2+1)^{1/2}}\right]^{\mu(t)}\geq\delta\left[\frac{x/r}{(s^2+1)^{1/2}}\right]^{\mu(x)},$$

where $\delta = 2^{-\mu(c)/2}$, and the last inequality holds since $\mu(t)$ is an increasing function. In addition note that, for $s \geq 1$, we have

$$s^2 + 1 \leq 2s^2, \quad (s^2+1)^{\mu(x)/2} \leq 2^{\mu(x)/2} s^{\mu(x)} \leq \delta^{-1} s^{\mu(x)}.$$

Then for $0 \leq r \leq x$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} u(x,r) &\geq rh(2x) \int_1^{x/r} \left[\frac{x/r}{(s^2+1)^{1/2}}\right]^{\mu(t(s))} ds \\ &\geq \delta r (x/r)^{\mu(x)} h(2x) \int_1^{x/r} \frac{1}{(s^2+1)^{\mu(x)/2}}\, ds \\ &\geq \delta^2 r (x/r)^{\mu(x)} h(2x) \int_1^{x/r} \frac{1}{s^{\mu(x)}}\, ds \\ &= \delta^2 r (x/r)^{\mu(x)} h(2x) \frac{1}{\mu(x)-1} [1 - (r/x)^{\mu(x)-1}]. \end{aligned}$$

Now our assertion follows easily. □

To prove Theorem 3.6 we need the following.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $b = -c$, $\gamma \in (1,\infty)$, $\mu(t) \equiv \mu \in [1, d-2)$,*

$$h(t) = |t|^{-1} |\ln |t||^{-\gamma}$$

and take $u(x,r)$ from (4.4). For x small enough split $u(x,r)$ into two parts $u_1(x,r)$ and $u_2(x,r)$, where the first one is the integral from $-2|x|$ to $2|x|$.

Then

(i) For small enough $x \neq 0$ and $r \neq 0$ we have

$$u_1(x,r) \leq N |\ln |x||^{-\gamma} (|x|/r)^{\mu-1} \quad \text{if} \quad \mu > 1,$$

$$u_1(x,r) \leq N |\ln |x||^{-\gamma} \ln(|x|/r) \quad \text{if} \quad \mu = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad 2r \leq |x|,$$

where N is independent of x and r. Also $u_2(x,r) \to u(0,0) < \infty$ as $(x,r) \to 0$.

(ii) If $r(x) = r(|x|) = o(|x|)$ as $x \to 0$ and $r(x)$ is differentiable and $|r'(x)| \leq 1$, then

$$\lim_{x \to 0} x |\ln x|^{\gamma} [u_2(x, r(x))]' =: \rho \in (-\infty, 0). \tag{4.12}$$

Proof. Since $u(x,r)$ is an even function in x may concentrate on $x > 0$.

(i) First, let $\mu > 1$. By the substitution $t = x + sr$ and the facts that $x^{\mu-1} |\ln x|^{-\gamma}$ is an increasing function for small $x > 0$ and $(s^2+1)^{-\mu/2}$ is an integrable function we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} u_1(x,r) &\leq (2x)^{\mu-1} |\ln(2x)|^{-\gamma} \int_{-2x}^{2x} \frac{dt}{[(t-x)^2 + r^2]^{\mu/2}} \\ &\leq N x^{\mu-1} |\ln x|^{-\gamma}\, r^{1-\mu} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{ds}{[s^2+1]^{\mu/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

If $\mu = 1$, then

$$u_1(x,r) \le |\ln(2x)|^{-\gamma} \int_{-2x}^{2x} \frac{dt}{[(t-x)^2 + r^2]^{1/2}}$$

$$\le N|\ln x|^{-\gamma} \int_{-x/r}^{x/r} \frac{ds}{[s^2+1]^{1/2}} \le N|\ln x|^{-\gamma} \left(2 + \int_{1 \le |s| \le x/r} \frac{ds}{|s|}\right)$$

$$\le N|\ln x|^{-\gamma} \ln(x/r).$$

The dominated convergence theorem implies the second claim in (i) since, for $|t| \ge 2x$ we have $|t-x| \ge (1/2)|t|$ and the integrand in the expression of $u_2(x,r)$, written as the integral over $[-c,c]$, is dominated by $2^\mu h(t)$, which is integrable.

(ii) First, observe that, as is easy to see, we may assume that $c < 1$. Next, we have

$$[u_2(x,r(x))]' = -\frac{2^\mu\, x^{\mu-1}}{[x^2 + r^2(2x)]^{\mu/2} |\ln(2x)|^\gamma}$$

$$-\frac{2^\mu\, x^{\mu-1}}{[9x^2 + r^2(2x)]^{\mu/2} |\ln(2x)|^\gamma} + g(x), \tag{4.13}$$

where

$$g(x) = \mu \left(\int_{2x}^{c} + \int_{-c}^{-2x}\right) \frac{|t|^{\mu-1}}{|\ln|t||^\gamma} \frac{(t-x) - r(x)r'(x)}{[(t-x)^2 + r^2(x)]^{1+\mu/2}}\, dt. \tag{4.14}$$

Obviously, the sum of the first two terms on the right in (4.13) multiplied by $x|\ln x|^\gamma$ tends to $-2^\mu(1 + 1/3^\mu)$.

Next, we multiply the first term on the right-hand side of (4.14) by $x|\ln x|^\gamma$ and make the change of variables $t = xs$ so that the resulting expression equals

$$\mu \int_2^\infty \frac{|\ln x|^\gamma}{|\ln s + \ln x|^\gamma} \frac{s^{\mu-1}[s - 1 - r(x)r'(x)/x]}{[(s-1)^2 + (r(x)/x)^2]^{\mu/2+1}} I_{s \le c/x}\, ds.$$

On the set $s \in (2, c/x)$ we have $\ln s + \ln x \le \ln c$, $|\ln s + \ln x| \ge |\ln c|$ $(c < 1)$, and

$$\frac{|\ln x|^\gamma}{|\ln s + \ln x|^\gamma} = \frac{|\ln s + \ln x - \ln s|^\gamma}{|\ln s + \ln x|^\gamma} \le N + N\frac{|\ln s|^\gamma}{|\ln s + \ln x|^\gamma} \le N + N|\ln s|^\gamma.$$

One can make a similar argument about the second term on (4.14). Hence by the dominated convergence theorem

$$\lim_{x \downarrow 0} x|\ln x|^\gamma g(x) = \mu \int_2^\infty \frac{s^{\mu-1}}{(s-1)^{\mu+1}}\, ds - \mu \int_{-\infty}^{-2} \frac{|s|^{\mu-1}}{|s-1|^{\mu+1}}\, ds$$

Observe that

$$\mu \int_2^\infty \frac{s^{\mu-1}}{(s-1)^{\mu+1}}\, ds = -\int_2^\infty s^{\mu-1}\, d(s-1)^{-\mu}$$

$$= 2^{\mu-1} + (\mu - 1) \int_2^\infty (1 - s^{-1})^{-\mu} s^{-2}\, ds$$

$$= 2^{\mu-1} + 2^{\mu-1} - 1 = 2^{\mu} - 1.$$

This combined with the above result concerning the first two terms on the right in (4.13) proves (4.12). The lemma is proved. □

5. Proof of Theorems 3.2 and 3.4

Proof of Theorem 3.2. *Case* $d = 3$. Take $b = -1$, $c = 1$, introduce $\mu \equiv 1/\varepsilon$, $h \equiv 1$, and take $u(x, r)$ from (4.4), so that

$$u(x, r) = \int_{-1}^{1} \frac{|t|^{1/\varepsilon}}{[(t-x)^2 + r^2]^{1/(2\varepsilon)}}\, dt, \tag{5.1}$$

which is quite similar to (2.5).

Then we have (4.5) outside the interval $[-1, 1]$ of the x-axis with

$$\omega(x, r) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} = \lambda,$$

so that according to (3.5) the function $v(x) = u(x_1, |x'|)$ satisfies $L_\lambda v = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$ outside the interval $[-1, 1]$ of the x_1-axis.

Observe that, if $r(x) = x^\eta$, for an $\eta > 0$, then the limit in (4.10) equals

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} \lim_{x \downarrow 0} x^{\eta(1-1/\varepsilon)+1/\varepsilon},$$

which is infinite if $\eta > 1/(1-\varepsilon)$. Also in that case (4.9) is satisfied so that by Lemma 4.5

$$\lim_{\substack{|x'|=r(x_1) \\ x_1 \downarrow 0}} v(x) = \infty.$$

and owing to the symmetry of v with respect to x_1

$$\lim_{\substack{|x'|=r(x_1) \\ x_1 \to 0}} v(x) = \infty. \tag{5.2}$$

However, by the monotone convergence theorem

$$\lim_{|x'| \downarrow 0} v(0, x') = 2. \tag{5.3}$$

By Lemma 2.1 with $w(x) = 1/|x|$, for which $L_\lambda w \le 0$, since $\lambda > 1$, the origin is irregular relative to L_λ, G', where G' is defined by (3.6).

On the other hand, by the criterion due to K. Itô and H. McKean (see Section 7.11 in [6]; in their examples, however, there is an error, see the last line on page 259), the origin is a regular relative to Δ boundary point for the surface $|x'| = r(x_1)$, $x_1 \in (0, 1]$, because

$$\int_0 \frac{dx}{x|\ln[r(x)/x]|} = (\eta - 1)^{-1} \int_0 \frac{dx}{x|\ln x|} = \infty.$$

Now we get the assertion of the theorem by the first part of Remark 3.3.

Case $d \ge 4$. Introduce

$$\mu(t) = (d-2)/\varepsilon, \quad h(2t) = |t|^{-1} |\ln|t||^{-\alpha},$$

where $\alpha \in (1,\infty)$, and take $u(x,r)$ from (4.4) with $b=-c$ and $c>0$ so small that h is a decreasing function on $(0,c]$. Then we have (4.5) outside the interval $[-c,c]$ of the x-axis with

$$\omega(x,r)=\frac{d-2}{\varepsilon}=\lambda(d-2),$$

so that, according to (3.5), the function $v(x)=u(x_1,|x'|)$ satisfies $L_\lambda v=0$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ outside the interval $[-c,c]$ of the x_1-axis.

For

$$r(x)=x|\ln x|^{-\eta},$$

where $\eta=1/(d-3)$, the limit in (4.10) equals

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{d-2-\varepsilon}\lim_{x\downarrow 0}|\ln x|^{\eta((d-2)/\varepsilon-1)-\alpha},$$

which is infinite if

$$(d-3)\alpha<(d-2)/\varepsilon-1. \tag{5.4}$$

The set of $\alpha>1$ satisfying (5.4) is nonempty since $\varepsilon\in(0,1)$. We pick any such α. Also observe that (4.9) is satisfied. In that case (5.2) holds.

On the other hand, by the monotone convergence theorem

$$\lim_{|x'|\downarrow 0} v(0,x')=v(0,0)=u(0,0)<\infty.$$

Then by lemma 2.1 with $w(x)=|x|^{-(d-2)}$ the origin is irregular relative to L_λ, G', where G' is defined by (3.6).

At the same time, by the criterion due to K. Itô and H. McKean (see Section 7.11 in [6]) the origin is a regular relative to Δ boundary point for the surface $|x'|=r(x_1)$, $x_1\in[0,1/2]$, because

$$\int_0\left(\frac{r(x)}{x}\right)^{d-3}\frac{dx}{x}=-\int_0|\ln x|^{-1}d|\ln x|=\infty.$$

We finish the proof of the theorem as in the case of $d=3$. □

Remark 5.1. In [13] E.M. Landis constructed a similar example for $d=3$ by means of the potential

$$\int_a^b\frac{1}{[(t-x_1)^2+r^2]^{\nu/2}}\,dt,$$

where $0\le a\le b$, also used in [20]. In [13], [18], and [20] the solutions are given by weighted sums of those potentials.

Proof of Theorem 3.4. *Case* $d=3$. Introduce

$$\mu(t)=1+(\ln|\ln|t||)^{-1},\quad h\equiv 1,\quad r(t)=|t|^{1+|\ln|\ln|t||}.$$

Notice that for sufficiently small $c>0$ and $b=-c$ the conditions of Lemma 4.3 are satisfied and the conditions of Lemma 4.1 are satisfied with

$$\beta(t)=\mu(t)|t|^{\mu(t)}h(t),\quad \nu(t)=\mu(t)+2. \tag{5.5}$$

It follows that u introduced by (4.4) satisfies equation (4.5) in $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}_+$ apart from the interval $[-c,c]$ on the x-axis, where ω is defined in Lemma 4.1 with the above μ,β,ν, and this ω is a continuous function.

Then $v(x)=u(x_1,|x'|)$ satisfies $L_\lambda v=0$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$ apart from the interval $[-c,c]$ on the x_1-axis, where $\lambda(x)=\omega(x_1,|x'|)$ is a continuous function and $\lambda(0)=\omega(0,0)=\mu(0)=1$, so that by Remark 3.1 the coefficients of L_λ are continuous in the closure of G', where G' is defined by (3.6). In that case, of course, the coefficients of L_λ are smooth in $\bar G'\setminus\{0\}$.

Then observe that the expression under the limit sign in (4.10) equals $\ln|\ln x|$ and, thus, (4.10) holds true. Also

$$(\mu(x)-1)\ln(r(x)/x)=\ln x\to-\infty \tag{5.6}$$

as $x\downarrow 0$. Therefore (4.9) is satisfied as well.

Hence by Lemma 4.5 equations (4.11) and (5.2) hold again. Furthermore, since $v(x)$ is even with respect to x_1, we again have (5.2).

On the other hand, by the monotone convergence theorem

$$\lim_{|x'|\downarrow 0} v(0,x')=\lim_{r\downarrow 0}u(0,r)=2c<\infty.$$

By Remark 4.2 we have $\omega\ge 1$, so that $\lambda\ge 1$ and $L_\lambda w\le 0$ for $w=1/|x|$. Therefore, by Lemma 2.1, with w defined as above, the origin is not regular relative to L_λ , G'.

The fact that the origin is regular for Δ, G' again follows from Section 7.11 of [6] (and Remark 3.3) since

$$\int_0\frac{dx}{x|\ln[r(x)/x]|}=\int_0\frac{d\ln x}{|\ln x|(\ln|\ln x|)}=\infty.$$

This proves the theorem in case $d=3$.

Case $d\ge 4$. This time take a number $\gamma>1$ and define

$$\mu(t)=d-2+\gamma(d-3)\frac{\ln\ln|\ln|t||}{\ln|\ln|t||}, \tag{5.7}$$

$$h(2t)=|t|^{-1}|\ln|t||^{-1}(\ln|\ln|t||)^{-2},$$

$$r(x)=|x|\,|\ln|x||^{-1/(d-3)}(\ln|\ln|x||)^{-1/(d-3)}.$$

Observe that one can choose $c>0$ so small that for $b=-c$ the assertions made in case $d=3$ before (5.6) are still valid with thus defined μ, h, r, and $\lambda(x)=(d-2)^{-1}\omega(x_1,|x'|)$ in place of those μ, h, r, and λ introduced in case $d=3$. Also note that (4.9) holds because this time $\mu(t)$ does not even go to 1 as $t\downarrow 0$.

Let

$$\phi(t)=\gamma(d-3)\frac{\ln\ln|\ln t|}{\ln|\ln t|},\quad g(x)=\ln|\ln x|.$$

Then observe that, for $x>0$ we have

$$r(x)(x/r(x))^{\mu(x)}h(2x)=|\ln x|^{\phi(x)/(d-3)}(\ln|\ln x|)^{-1+\phi/(d-3)} \tag{5.8}$$

$$= [g(x)]^{\gamma-1+\gamma(\ln g(x))/g(x)} \to \infty$$

as $x \downarrow 0$ which yields (4.10), (4.11), and (5.2).

On the other hand, by the monotone convergence theorem

$$\lim_{|x'|\downarrow 0} v(0,x') = \lim_{r\downarrow 0} u(0,r) = u(0,0) = \int_{-c}^{c} h(t)\,dt < \infty.$$

This and Lemma 2.1 with $w = 1/|x|^{d-2}$, which satisfies $L_\lambda w \leq 0$ since $\lambda \geq 1$, shows that the origin is not regular relative to L_λ, G'.

We finish the proof by observing that

$$\int_0 \left(\frac{r(x)}{x}\right)^{d-3} \frac{dx}{x} = \int_0 \frac{d\ln x}{|\ln x| \ln|\ln x|} = \infty,$$

so that the fact that the origin is regular relative to Δ, G' again follows from [6] and Remark 3.3. The theorem is proved. □

Remark 5.2. Observe that in Theorem 3.4 μ is not Dini continuous at 0 and $r(t) \in (0,t)$, $\forall t > 0$, in both cases. Hence, it follows by Remark 4.4 (see (4.8)) that the modulus of continuity ϕ of the coefficients of the corresponding differential operator does not satisfy the uniform Dini condition in the domain G' from the proof of Theorem 3.4. However, ϕ misses the Dini condition by quite much. It even misses, albeit barely, the condition

$$\int_0 \frac{\phi(r)}{r|\ln r|}\,dr < \infty. \tag{5.9}$$

The proof of Theorem 3.4 shows that if (5.9) (which is weaker than the Dini condition) is violated, then it may happen that $\Delta \not\to L$. We could not construct an example of an operator L such that (5.9) holds but $\Delta \not\to L$. In this connection a natural question arises:

Is it true that, if condition (5.9) is satisfied, then all points regular relative to Δ are also regular relative to L?

6. Proof of Theorem 3.6.

Proof of Theorem 3.6 *Case $d \geq 3$ and $\varepsilon < 1/(d-2)$.* Set $\lambda \equiv \varepsilon$ and observe that (3.5) and easy computations show that the function $v(x) = |x'|^{1-\varepsilon(d-2)}$ satisfies $L_\lambda v = 0$ outside of the x_1-axis.

This v is a barrier relative to L_λ at the origin for any domain, whose closure intersects the x_1-axis only at the origin. It follows that the origin is regular relative to L_λ and G' defined by (3.6), where $r(t)$ is any continuous function on $[0,c)$ for some $c > 0$ and, moreover, $r(t) > 0$ for $t > 0$ and $r(0) = 0$. We take $r(x_1) = e^{-\varepsilon/x_1}$ and, by what was said in Remark 2.3, the origin is irregular relative to Δ and G'.

Case $d \geq 4$ and $\varepsilon \in (1/(d-2), 1)$. Take $u(x,r)$ from Lemma 4.6 with $\mu = \varepsilon(d-2)$. Then we have (4.5) outside the interval $[-c,c]$ of the x_1-axis with $\omega(x,r) = \varepsilon(d-2) = \lambda(d-2)$, so that according to (3.5) the function

$$v(x) = u(x_1, |x'|)$$

satisfies $L_\lambda v = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ outside the interval $[-c, c]$ of the x_1-axis.

Let $\eta \in (0,1)$ be such that

$$\eta(\mu - 1) < 1, \quad \eta(d-3) > 1.$$

Notice that the set of such η is nonempty because $1/(\mu-1) > 1/(d-3)$ since $d - 3 > \varepsilon(d-2) - 1$. Set

$$r(t) = |t|\,|\ln|t|\,|^{-\eta}, \tag{6.1}$$

and let G' be the domain defined by (3.6).

We claim that $v(0) - v(x)$ is a barrier relative to L_λ, G' (see Section 2 for the definition of a barrier). In order to prove the claim, take $u_1(x,r)$ and $u_2(x,r)$ from Lemma 4.6 and observe that

$$v(0) - v(x) = u(0,0) - u_2(x_1, |x'|) - u_1(x_1, |x'|). \tag{6.2}$$

By Lemma 4.6 (i) in G' we have

$$u_1(x_1, |x'|) \le u_1(x_1, r(x_1)) \le N(|x_1|/r(x_1))^{\mu-1} |\ln|x_1||^{-\gamma}$$
$$= N|\ln|x_1||^{\eta(\mu-1)-\gamma} \to 0$$

as $x_1 \to 0$ (recall that $\gamma \in (1,\infty)$). Also by Lemma 4.6 (i) $u_2(x_1, |x'|) \to u(0,0)$ as $x \to 0$. It follows that $v(x) \in C(\bar{G}')$ and that to prove the claim it suffices to show the following:

$$\varliminf_{x_1 \downarrow 0} \frac{u(0,0) - u_2(x_1, r(x_1))}{u_1(x_1, r(x_1))} > 1. \tag{6.3}$$

By Lemma 4.6 (i) it suffices to prove (6.3) with $N|\ln|x_1||^{\eta(\mu-1)-\gamma}$ in place of $u_1(x_1, r(x_1))$. After this we use the L'Hospital's rule to observe that

$$\varliminf_{x_1 \downarrow 0} \frac{u(0,0) - u_2(x_1, r(x_1))}{|\ln x_1|^{\eta(\mu-1)-\gamma}} = \frac{-1}{\gamma - \eta(\mu-1)} \lim_{x_1 \downarrow 0} \frac{x_1 |\ln x_1|^\gamma [u_2(x_1, r(x_1))]'}{|\ln x_1|^{\eta(\mu-1)-1}},$$

where the last limit does exist and equals ∞ in light of Lemma 4.6 (ii).

Thus, with our claim being proved, by what is said before Lemma 2.1, the origin is a regular boundary point relative to L_λ, G'.

By the criterion from [6] (see Section 7.11) and Remark 3.3 the origin is an irregular boundary point relative to Δ, G' because

$$\int_0 \left(\frac{r(t)}{t}\right)^{d-3} \frac{dt}{t} = \int_0 \frac{dt}{t|\ln t|^{\eta(d-3)}} < \infty$$

since by our choice of η we have $\eta(d-3) > 1$.

Case $d \ge 4$ and $\varepsilon = 1/(d-2)$. Take $u(x,r)$ from Lemma 4.6 with $\mu = \varepsilon(d-2) = 1$ and $\gamma \in (1,2)$. We have (4.5) outside the interval $[-c,c]$ of the x_1-axis with $\omega(x,r) = 1$, so that according to (3.5) the function $v(x) = u(x_1, |x'|)$ satisfies $L_\lambda v = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ outside the interval $[-c,c]$ of the x_1-axis.

Take any $\eta > 0$ and let a function $r(t)$ and a domain G' be defined by (6.1) and (3.6), respectively. Take $u_1(x_1, r)$ and $u_2(x_1, r)$ from Lemma 4.6 and observe that (6.2) holds.

By Lemma 4.6 (i) in G' we have

$$u_1(x_1,|x'|) \le u_1(x_1,r(x_1)) \le N|\ln|x_1||^{-\gamma}\ln|\ln|x_1||^{\eta}$$
$$\le N|\ln|x_1||^{-\gamma/2} \to 0 \tag{6.4}$$

as $x_1 \to 0$. We also have $u_2(x_1,|x'|) \to u(0,0)$ as $x \to 0$ by Lemma 4.6 (i). This and (6.4) imply that $v \in C(\bar{G}')$. In order to prove that $v(0)-v(x)$ is a barrier at the origin relative to L_λ, G' it suffices to show that (6.3) holds. As in the previous case thanks to (6.4) we may replace the denominator with $N|\ln|x_1||^{-\gamma/2}$. Next, by L'Hospital's rule we have

$$\varliminf_{x_1\downarrow 0}\frac{u(0,0)-u_2(x_1,r(x_1))}{|\ln x_1|^{-\gamma/2}} = \frac{-1}{\gamma/2}\lim_{x_1\downarrow 0} x_1|\ln x_1|^{\gamma/2+1}[u_2(x_1,r(x_1))]'$$

where the last expression equals ∞ due to Lemma 4.6 (ii) and our choice of $\gamma \in (1,2)$. This proves (6.3) and hence $v(0)-v(x)$ is a barrier at the origin relative to L_λ, G'. Thus, the origin is regular relative to L_λ, G'.

Now we take $\eta > 1/(d-3)$. We know from the previous case that for such η the origin is irregular relative to Δ, G'. This finishes the proof. □

7. Comments on some underlying ideas

Let $a(x)$ be a $d \times d$ symmetric matrix valued Borel measurable function on $\mathbb{R}^d$ which is bounded and uniformly nondegenerate. Let Ω be the set of continuous $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued functions $\omega = \omega(t)$ on $[0,\infty)$. For $\omega \in \Omega$ introduce $x_t(\omega) = \omega_t$ and let N_t be the σ-field of subsets of Ω generated by the sets $\{\omega : x_s(\omega) \in \Gamma\}$ for s running through $[0,t]$ and Γ running through the set of Borel subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$. By N_∞ we denote the σ-field of subsets of Ω generated by the sets $\{\omega : x_s(\omega) \in \Gamma\}$ for $s < \infty$. As is known from Theorem 3 of [10], for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ there exists a probability measure P_x on $\{\Omega, N_\infty\}$ such that $X = (x_t, \infty, N_t, P_x)$ is a strong Markov process and $X = (x_t, \infty, N_{t+}, P_x)$ is a Markov process (in the terminology of [3]) such that for any twice continuously differentiable function $u(x)$ on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with compact support and any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t \ge 0$ we have

$$u(x) = E_x u(x_t) - E_x \int_0^t Lu(x_t)\,dt.$$

This property and the Markov property imply that

$$u(x_t) - \int_0^t Lu(x_t)\,dt$$

is a martingale relative to (N_t, P_x) for any x and this combined with the strong Markov property easily shows that, for any bounded domain $G \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $u \in C^2(\bar{G})$, and $x \in G$, we have

$$u(x) = E_x u(x_{\tau_G}) - E_x \int_0^{\tau_G} Lu(x_t)\,dt, \tag{7.1}$$

where

$$\tau_G = \inf\{t \ge 0 : x_t \notin G\}.$$

In light of this, naturally, for any bounded domain G, Borel bounded g on ∂G and f on G the function

$$E_x g(x_{\tau_G}) - E_x \int_0^{\tau_G} f(x_t)\, dt$$

is called a probabilistic solution of the equation $Lu = -f$ in G with the Dirichlet boundary condition g. We are interested in the case where $f = 0$ and the main issue for us is whether for a $p \in \partial G$ and any continuous g it holds that

$$\lim_{\substack{x \in G \\ x \to p}} E_x g(x_{\tau_G}) = g(p).$$

If it holds indeed, p is called a regular point.

If the coefficients of L are in $C^\delta(\bar G)$, $G \in C^{2+\delta}$, $f \in C^\delta(\bar G)$, and $g \in C^{2+\delta}(\partial G)$, the equation $Lu = -f$ in G with boundary condition g has a unique solution $u \in C^{2+\delta}(\bar G)$, which owing to what was said about (7.1) implies that the probabilistic solution coincides with u. In particular,

$$\mathcal{R}(G) f(x) = E_x \int_0^{\tau_G} f(x_t)\, dt.$$

This and the fact that $\tau_{G_n} \to \tau_G$ as $n \to \infty$ if the domains $G_n \uparrow G$ implies that the notions of regular points introduced here and in Section 2 agree if the coefficients of L are in $C^\delta_{\rm loc}(G)$.

In a subsequent paper we will show that X is a strong Feller process (see Section 13.1 in [3] for the definition) and therefore, owing to [8], p is a regular point if and only if

$$P_p\{\tau'_G = 0\} = 1,$$

where

$$\tau'_G = \inf\{t > 0 : x_t \notin G\}.$$

One knows from Blumenthal's 0-1 law that $P_p\{\tau'_G = 0\}$ is either zero or one.

Remark 7.1. Take G and G' from (3.2) and (3.6), respectively. Then the origin is regular with respect to Δ, G if and only if it is regular relative to Δ, G'.

Indeed, in one way this follows from the fact that $G' \subset G$ (see Section 2). In the opposite direction, if the origin is not regular relative to Δ, G, then $\tau_G > 0$ (P_0-a.s.), owing to symmetry, $\tau_{-G} > 0$ (P_0-a.s.), and hence $\tau_{G'} = \tau_G \wedge \tau_{-G} > 0$ (P_0-a.s.), so that the origin is irregular relative to Δ, G'.

Now we can explain the idea behind our examples. Denote by Δ_d the Laplacian in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Itô and McKean in [6] characterized $r(x)$ for which the origin is Δ_d, G_d-regular with $G_d = G$ defined in (3.2). One sees that for $d = 3$ and $d = 4$ the classes of $r(x)$ yielding regularity of the origin for Δ_d, G_d are quite different. Since everything is invariant with respect to rotations about the x_1-axis, it was natural to figure out what is the difference between the Laplacians in $d = 3$ and $d = 4$ in the coordinates x_1, r ($r = |x'|$). It

turns out that in $d=4$ one has the extra term $(1/r)D_r u$, so that the x'-component of the corresponding Markov process is pushed away from the origin harder than in the case of the three-dimensional Laplacian. One gets such an additional term for $d=3$ as well if one replaces the (two-dimensional) Laplacian with respect to x' with an operator built from the matrix $a(x')$ with one eigenvalue 1 corresponding to the eigenvector $x'/|x'|$ and the other eigenvalue equal to 2 and corresponding to the eigenvector orthogonal to $x'/|x'|$. Then, we recall that for Δ_4 the function $1/|x|^2$ is harmonic and from the start instead of the 3d Laplacian we take L_λ with $\lambda=2$ in $\mathbb{R}^3$. By the above argument we conclude that the function

$$u(x_1,|x'|)=\int_0^1 \frac{t^2}{(t-x_1)^2+|x'|^2}\,dt, \quad x\in\mathbb{R}^3,$$

satisfies $L_\lambda u=0$ if $x_1\notin[0,1]$ or $x'\neq 0$. It follows that for any function $r(x_1)$, $x_1\in[0,2]$, such that $r(0)=r(2)=0$ and $r(x_1)>0$ for $x_1\in(0,2)$, we have

$$u(x_1,|x'|)=v(x_1,|x'|)$$

in

$$D_3=\mathbb{R}^3\setminus\{x: x_1\in[0,2], |x'|\le r(x_1)\},$$

where $v=v(x_1,\sqrt{x_2^2+x_3^2+x_4^2})$ is the solution of $\Delta_4 v=0$ in

$$D_4=\mathbb{R}^4\setminus\{x: x_1\in[0,2], |x'|\le r(x_1)\}$$

with the boundary data $v(x_1,|x'|)=u(x_1,|x'|)$ on ∂D_4. By Section 7.11 in [6], if

$$\int_0 \frac{dx}{x[x/r(x)]}<\infty \quad\text{and}\quad \int_0 \frac{dx}{x|\ln[x/r(x)]|}=\infty,$$

then the origin is regular relative to Δ_3, D_3 and is not regular relative to Δ_4, D_4, in which case the limit

$$\lim_{x_1\downarrow 0} v(x_1,r(x_1))=\lim_{x_1\downarrow 0} u(x_1,r(x_1))$$

if it exists, most likely is different from $v(0)=u(0)=1$, and, if this is true, we have a definite proof that the origin is not regular relative to L_λ, D_3 from the point of view of Markov processes. Observe that the coefficients of L_λ are discontinuous inside D_3 and there is no PDE theory or regular points for operators whose coefficients are discontinuous inside domains.

More generally, we know from Section 3 how to build an operator in x' variables for $d=3$ whose radial part is $u_{rr}+(\lambda/r)u_r$. It corresponds to the Laplacian in, so to speak, $\lambda+1$-dimensional space. When we add the second order derivative with respect to x_1 and obtain L_λ, we are dealing with the Laplacian in $\lambda+2$-dimensional space, where $1/|x|^\lambda$ is a harmonic function. This leads to the guess that the direct analogue of (2.5):

$$v_\lambda(x):=\int_0^1 \frac{t^\lambda}{[(t-x_1)^2+|x'|^2]^{\lambda/2}}\,dt, \quad x\in\mathbb{R}^3,$$

is an L_λ-harmonic function and if $\lambda > 1$, so that $\lambda + 2 > 3$, then we expect the same conclusions to hold as in the case of $\lambda = 2$. These were our starting ideas.

One more relevant comment is that, since the operators L_λ have discontinuous coefficients for which there is no PDE theory of regular points, we avoided using the above, somewhat incomplete, probabilistic arguments in order to attract readers not familiar with the theory of Markov processes. This led to considering G' in place of G and introducing u by (5.1) rather than using the above v_λ.

References

[1] Yu.A. Alkhutov *On the regularity of boundary points with respect to the Dirichlet problem for second-order elliptic equations*, Mat. Zametki, Vol. 30:3 (1981), 333-342, in Russian; English translation in Math. Notes, Vol. 30 (1982), No. 3, 655–660.

[2] P. Bauman, *A Wiener test for nondivergence structure, second-order elliptic equations*, Indiana Univ. Math J., Vol. 34 (1985), No. 4, 825–844.

[3] E.B. Dynkin, Markov processes, Gosudarstv. Izdat. Fiz.-Mat. Lit., Moscow 1963, in Russian; English translation Vols. I, II. Die Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften, Bände 121, 122 Academic Press Inc., Publishers, New York; Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Göttingen-Heidelberg 1965.

[4] L. Helms, Potential theory, Universitext, Springer, London, 2014.

[5] R.M. Hervé, *Recherche axiomatique sur la théorie des fonctions surharmoniques et du potentiel*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble), Vol. 12 (1962), 415–571.

[6] K. Itô and H.P. McKean, Diffusion processes and their sample paths, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1965.

[7] V.A. Kondrat'ev and E.M. Landis, *Qualitative theory of second-order linear partial differential equations*, Partial differential equations - 3 (1988), 99–215, Itogi Nauki i Tekhniki. Ser. Sovrem. Probl. Mat. Fund. Napr., 32, VINITI, Moscow, in Russian; English translation in Partial differential equations. III. The Cauchy problem. Qualitative theory of partial differential equations, Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences, 32, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991, 87-192.

[8] N.V. Krylov, *On the regular boundary points for Markov processes*, Teoriya Veroyatnostei i eye Primeneniya, Vol. 11 (1966), No. 4, 690–695 in Russian; English translation in Theor. Probability Appl., Vol. 11 (1966), No. 4, 609–614.

[9] N.V. Krylov, *On the first boundary value problem for elliptic equations of second order*, Differentsial'nye Uravneniya, Vol. 3 (1967), 315-326, in Russian; English translation in Differential Equations, Vol. 3 (1967), 158–164.

[10] N.V. Krylov, *On the selection of a Markov process from a system of processes and the construction of quasi-diffusion processes*, Izvestiya Akademii Nauk SSSR, seriya matematicheskaya, Vol. 37 (1973), No. 3, 691–708 in Russian; English translation in Math. USSR Izvestija, Vol. 7 (1973), No. 3, 691–709.

[11] N.V. Krylov, Controlled diffusion processes, Nauka, Moscow, 1977, in Russian; English translation in Stochastic Modelling and Applied Probability, Vol. 14, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1980 and 2009.

[12] N.V. Krylov, Lectures on elliptic and parabolic equations in Hölder spaces, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1996; Russian translation, "Nauchnaya kniga", Novosibirsk, 1998.

[13] E.M. Landis, *s -capacity and its applications to the study of solutions of a second-order elliptic equation with discontinuous coefficients*, Mat. Sb., Vol. 76:118 (1968), 186-213, in Russian; English translation in Math. USSR-Sbornik, Vol. 5 (1968) 1968, No. 2, 177–204.

[14] E.M. Landis, Second order equations of elliptic and parabolic type, Nauka, Moscow, 1971, in Russian; English translation: Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1997.

[15] H. Lebesgue, *Sur des cas d'impossibilité du problème de Dirichlet ordinaire*, C.R. Séances Soc. Math. France, Vol. 41 (1913), p. 17, reproduced in Oeuvres scientifiques, L'Enseignement Mathématique, Institut de Mathématiques, Université de Genève, Vol. 3, 1972-1973.

[16] K. Miller, *Exceptional boundary points for the nondivergence equation which are regular for the Laplace equation and vice-versa*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa, Vol. 22: 2 (1968), 315-330.

[17] K. Miller, *Nonequivalence of regular boundary points for the Laplace and nondivergence equations, even with continuous coefficients*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa, Vol. 24: 1 (1970), 159–163.

[18] A.A. Novruzov, *The Dirichlet problem for second-order elliptic equations*, Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Vol. 246 (1979), No. 1, 11–14 in Russian; English translation in Soviet Math. Dokl., Vol. 20 (1979), No. 3, 437–440.

[19] O.A. Oleinik, *On the Dirichlet Problem for equations of elliptic type*, Mat. Sb., Vol. 24 (66) (1949), 3-14, in Russian.

[20] P.S. Urysohn, *Zur ersten Randwertaufgabe der Potentialtheorie. Ein Fall der Unlösbarkeit*, Math. Z., Vol. 23: 1-2 (1925), 155-158, in German; Russian translation pp. 101-106 in Trudy po topologii i drugim oblastyam matematiki, tom 1, Gos. Izdat. Tekhniko-Teoretich. Liter., Moskva-Leningrad, 1954.

[21] N. Wiener, *The Dirichlet Problem*, J. Math. Phys., Vol. 3 (1924), 127-146.

E-mail address: nkrylov@umn.edu

127 Vincent Hall, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, 55455

E-mail address: yastr002@umn.edu

127 Vincent Hall, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN, 55455